CANDOUR *The British Views-Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLIII No 10 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* October 1991

HISTORY - WHO CAN BELIEVE IT? [Part II]

HAVING destroyed the authority of the monarch, the Money Power's next target was the monarchy itself. We possess it still but only in puppet form - and how long will that performance be allowed by "Europe"?

*

TRUE BLUE RUIN

by ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE

THE French have words for it - the more things change, the more they remain the same - and so it is with history. When liberals want to denigrate some ancient and worthy value, they exhort the rest of us to "keep up with the modern world" and admonish us for "trying to put the clock back." But we do not have to "put the clock back," as they say, to find the times quite as "out of joint" as ever Hamlet did.

It is all in Jane Lane's historical novel, **Gin and Bitters.** If you have never heard of Jane Lane, it will be because she has revealed so much unpalatable truth in the scenery surrounding her fictional characters that she has been automatically consigned to Establishment oblivion. **Gin and Bitters** tells of the ever-rising, ever-disappointed hopes of the British people for honourable government. It covers the period between the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 and the Georgian aftermath of the burst South Sea Bubble. The parallels with our own experiences between another revolution (or possibly the same one) of 1917 and the terrorist horrors of our own day are indeed terrifying - but also edifying in showing how induced "mass thinking" usually ends in the massacre of the "thinkers," if so they can be called with any degree of accuracy.

The central figure of Jane Lane's story is a secret and pamphleteering Jacobite who spends his life in post-Stuart London, clerking for one who today would be termed "a good Conservative" - a kindly brewer who provides his clerk with a pittance and an attic where he can spend his leisure writing the truth of the revolutionary outrages daily committed against unwitting people "resolved to live peaceably under William III." He did not write to incite any violence, but to convince the people that the restoration of their true king "is necessary to their interest, to show them what they have lost in losing their lawful sovereign, to warn them of the practical evils they must expect under the kind of government which now rules over us, and to set forth as well as I am able the advantages they enjoyed under the ancient monarchy."

He pursues his vocation through the reigns of four figure-heads; through the dissipating of the legacy of ale-drinking "Merrie England" to the war-torn, debt-ridden, gin-slinging realm of George I. Through

the evils of the prototype of unnecessary wars, credit monopoly, unpayable debt and financial chicanery, he lives his lonely life and pens his true commentaries. From first to last, his is a labour of love with no reward in this life and the gallows to end it. And yet, in so far as he influences anyone, it is to that one's betterment. Therein lies the antidote to despair.

But to the parallel. Just as the gullible mass of peaceable Britons in the twentieth century suffer the treachery of Major and Kinnock, alien invasion and usurpation of power - any outrage of sovereignty, in fact, rather than be dubbed "right-wing extremists" - perennially hoping for better times after each change of government figureheads, just so seventeenth century Englishmen suffered the treachery of John Churchill, the deposition of their true king and the usurpation of "Dutch William". They did this all in the propaganda-induced belief that the first and the last would save them from the terrible tyranny of James II's "ravening popery" - a plague more to be feared than bubonic. They did not like William of Orange, but consoled themselves with the "safeguard" provided by his marriage to Mary Stuart, their deserted king's daughter. This tenuous link with legality served to comfort them with the illusion of continued monarchy, while they meekly acquiesced in the edicts of the secret oligarchy that survives to this day. They were unlikely to demand "their king again" so long as they thought they had one. Do we hear the echo of Mr "Common Market" Heath proclaiming that Britain merely exchanges her sovereignty at home for the same sovereignty in Europe?

Those "Dutch" Bankers

Twenty years before, England had been fighting the Dutch. Now the Revolution forced her to accept a Hollander king and to take a principal part in his personal vendetta with the current "wicked man" of Europe - Louis XIV of France. To this end, the French "subsidies" were exchanged for the "benevolence" of so-called "Dutch" bankers, who in 1694 enabled the war-impoverished English to finance the Grand Alliance (c.f. United Nations?) in its belligerent operations in Europe. The Bank of England was established by its loan of five million pounds to the unsuspecting public. There was no discrimination - it was open to everybody to pay the interest. It was a national debt, or rather the National Debt.

So the fruits of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 were soon institutionalised: a foreign war to eat up the national income, a foreign debt to feed the foreign war, a "national" bank to swallow all local banks and nourish the foreign debt to feed the foreign war; and to wash down all the woe with the least comprehension on the part of the victims - gin. Gin, the outlet for Holland's surplus barley; gin, the imported "blue ruin" that bankrupted English brewers and befuddled English wits; gin, sold over the counter in drinking dens and under the counter in grocers' shops to the debauchery of the young and the poison of the old. Today it is heroin that comes over the narrow sea.

The sole beneficiaries of this lamentable harvest seem to have been the issuers of the credits and surplusses, so it is worth recalling who were the financiers of this revolution that was alleged to be the triumph of the Protestant Reformation. Says the "with-it" brewer's son, "I have a profound admiration for the Jews, since they are the fathers of commerce and did indeed invent the banking system.

Moreover, without them we never would have had the Revolution, for Suasso, of whom you may have heard, lent King William two million pounds for his expedition, and Sir Solomon Medina, his banker, did likewise." Clearly the forerunners of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., without whom we might not have had the Bolshevik Revolution!

The son continued: "A bank begins to confer some real advantage to the realm only when it lends out the money it receives from this man to this other man who has need of it and will make it productive, and by creating money by means of banknotes and figures in a ledger [our italics] a bank quickens the nation's trade and keeps the circulation of cash flowing freely." Now that is a Tory sentiment if ever there was one, but the conservative brewer is not impressed. He thinks he can invest his money unaided and imagines that all such usurious practices are temporary and will come to an end when their "own Stuart Princess Anne is Queen." The Whigs see to it that he is disappointed. The war continues almost throughout her reign, each victory more expensive than the last, culminating in a dukedom and a palace for the traitor John Churchill and a Debt now swollen to fifty millions in twenty years. And still the people will not demand their lawful king.

The Turn Of The Tories

A recuperation period is required; at the tail end of Anne's life it is the turn of the Tories. We are now on very familiar ground. Harley and St John, having insinuated themselves up the backstairs to political eminence, set about making an artificial silk purse out of the Whig sow's ear. Allegedly Jacobites, they brought down the Duke of Marlborough, without whom there could be no war, and arranged a peace with France, both sides guaranteeing the Protestant Succession - even Jacobite Tories did not want a king who awkwardly remained faithful to his religious conviction when expediency demanded compromise. Harley and St John's "perks" were the Earldoms of Oxford and Bolingbroke. Here the Tories fell out "on a matter of principle". Bolingbroke ousted Harley (shades of a 1940 Churchill and Neville Chamberlain), but was unlucky enough to be outmanoeuvred by the Whigs gathering round Queen Anne's death-bed and found himself isolated with only his Jacobite horse, who obstinately refused to drink the water of apostasy. Bolingbroke was impeached on the very treaty that brought such long power to the Whigs and was approved by them on two subsequent occasions.

With the accession of "German George", who reigned in Hanover and spoke no English, the Revolution was consolidated, the Whigs were triumphant and the Party System was born. The people were again thwarted of their rightful king because the Tories, no less than the Whigs, had settled for a puppet monarch who would obey their will.

A piece of political and financial chicanery called the South Sea Company adopted by Robert Walpole, First Lord of the Treasury, brought untold wealth and political supremacy to him, scandal to his bribed ministers and ruin to the uninitiated when the great South Sea Bubble was burst. Robert Walpole bought and sold so secretly and betrayed his fellow-conspirators so ruthlessly that he, who had both blown up and pricked the fraudulent Bubble, was the only character to emerge from the ensuing maelstrom with a fortune to rival the Incas' and an enhanced reputation for prudence and integrity amidst his countrymen's orgy of greedy gambling! Two hundred years later, the same would be

done by and said of one Bernard Baruch, afterwards called "the uncrowned king of the United States" and the acknowledged adviser to five presidents. His bubble is known in the history books as the Wall Street Crash.

A Hollow Conservatism

Nowadays, no country considers itself free without a Bank to create "credit"; a Debt to create "working capital"; a Stock Exchange to "work" the working capital; and the whole economic anthill to - what was the phrase? - "confer real advantage on the realm." Two more wars financed by the "admirable Jews" have added accruing benefits. Now we have an International Bank and International Debt to make the universal wheel turn to everyone's advantage.

So why are the denizens of these fortunate realms so dissatisfied that whenever they are enduring the benefits of Whig, Socialist, Democratic or Conservative Revolution, be it bloody or bloodless, they have to have the possibility of a return to Conservatism dangled before them to prevent a counter-Revolution of devastating consequence? There have been Whigs and Tories; Liberals and Tories; Socialists and Tories; Communists and Tories. Significantly, it is the "true blues" who go on for ever. The ruin may acquire a little more ivy, but it remains essentially a ruin.

The Thinking Few

The really hopeful thought about all this is that the people as such are never going to change anything. They are always going to be innately uninterested in politics - that is how they have fallen for the party racket. Although they will always hanker after a king endowed with "the authority that comes from above" and bemoan the outrages committed against them in Democracy's name, they are never going to do more than dream of salvation when next a Conservative opposition brings a return to some mythical good old day.

It is hopeful because it means that the votes of the masses are not only not necessary, but positively detrimental to the promotion of good government. Even a few persons of integrity endowed with true authority and the courage to wield it can restore the ruins of their nation's integrity. It is only necessary for them to lead, i.e. to go first, when they get the chance, and not to herd and drove.

It would be very odd if the gospel analogy of people with sheep were not eternally apt. It has lost its efficacy only because we have been taught to think of a good shepherd as one standing afar off, whistling the sheepdogs to round up the flock into an enclosed space. In those circumstances the sheep, always manoeuvring to escape canine vigilance, never look where they are escaping to, and victory goes to the one with the most experienced dogs. It seems we need to emulate the Best Shepherd; even if the leader ends on the Cross, the followers do at least see where to go and will follow a man rather than be herded by a dog.

Read SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the British National Party. Sample copy 90p (annual subscription U.K. £11) from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN THE U.S.S.R?

by EDWARD CAIN

RECENT dramatic events in the Soviet Union have stunned many people. Suddenly a coup takes place. Gorbachev is out. Communism rears its ugly head. We are back in the Cold War. Was the West wise in reducing its armed forces? The world holds its breath. Then, as suddenly, the coup collapses. Gorbachev is back! Everyone breathes a great sigh of relief! Things have returned to normal! We can all settle down again. Or do these events have a deeper significance?

Two principles must be applied to understand the events in the USSR (and everywhere else). First, never trust the obvious. Second, answer the question: "Who benefits from the events?"

The first principle says in effect: "Dig below the surface," so we will do that. There are two closely related ideologies in the world - Secular (or Atheistic) Humanism and Marxism/Leninism. "Communism, as fully developed naturalism, equals humanism," said Karl Marx. Paul Kurtz, an American signatory of the **Humanist Manifesto** (1973), described Marx as "a humanist because he rejects theistic (God-centred) religion and defends atheism."

Godless Utopianism

Both Humanism and Marxism reject the concept of God. Both teach that only material things exist and that there is no spiritual meaning to life and no absolute truths or values. Both believe that man evolved and is inherently good. Both teach that man can be improved by changing his surroundings. Both believe that a tiny enlightened elite can effect these changes if they can control a One World government (or the governments of individual countries) which exercises tremendous power over its citizens. They both promise a utopia of peace and plenty for all.

The relationship between the two is so close that Humanism has been described as the mother, Marxism as the daughter; Humanism the root, Marxism the branch. Of course, there are differences. The main ones are Marxism treats economics as primary while Humanism tends to concentrate on philosophy and biology. Marxism teaches that political power must be seized by violence. Humanism believes that it can be achieved by manipulation, disinformation and gradual change.

Because it achieved complete control over the Soviet Union, Marxism had been able to implement its ideology fully. However, it failed to produce a better breed of humans or the promised wealth and prosperity after more than seventy years in the Soviet Union and forty years in Eastern Europe. On the contrary, it practically destroyed the economies of those countries. The impoverishment of the USSR did not shake the faith of the Western Humanists who believe they are right in maintaining that manipulation is the best way to impose socialism. They believe the time is now ripe to include a weakened USSR in their form of the One World Government or New World Order.

So can we trust the obvious? The obvious is that hardliners staged a coup to oust Gorbachev and revert to the old style government but,

because of the democratic forces already unleashed in the USSR and the courage of the people, the coup failed. One major fact does not fit into that theory and that fact is Yeltsin. The two key figures promoting change in the Soviet Union are Gorbachev, who wants moderately paced change, and Yeltsin, who wants the rate of change to be greatly speeded up. In recent months, many have accused Gorbachev of sacking reformers and putting representatives of the old guard in positions of power. Some, including Yeltsin, have gone as far as to suggest that, in this way, he laid the foundation for the coup.

Now, were the coup genuine, surely the hardliners would have silenced the two key reformers, Gorbachev and Yeltsin. The fact that Yeltsin was not neutralised shows that either the coup was badly bungled or it was designed to fail! Why was Yeltsin able to communicate with the outside world by telephone from his besieged White House, and through a host of television and other journalists, for the full three days of the coup? Why was it not possible to cut the telephone line at the pole outside the building or at the telephone exchange? If Yeltsin had been silenced, there would have been no rallying point in Moscow and the world would not have been glued to their television sets.

Planned To Fail

The rapid and radical restructuring that followed the collapse of the coup is another indication that it was planned to fail. The Communist Party was very unpopular and discredited among the people, but not even Yeltsin could move against it without some earthshaking event. The coup provided that event! Were the coup leaders mere front men who were used by the faceless, behind-the-scenes plotters or were they aware that the coup was intended to fail? It is not possible to answer that question at this stage. The fact that lives were lost proves nothing. Marxists have always held human life lightly. The loss of life made the coup seem real.

Now for the second question. Who benefits? The answer, in a nutshell, is the the New World Order. Remember the last major event before the coup was the G-7 summit in London in July. Gorbachev made an impassioned plea for money to ward off a coup by hardliners, but the heads of the major Western governments were unmoved. The coup has sharply reminded them (and, more especially, their taxpayers) just how vulnerable Gorbachev is. No-one wants to return to the dark days of the Cold War and the threat of nuclear tipped missiles. A few hundred billion is a small price to pay to avoid that. So: watch the money and technology flow into the USSR! "The fact that they so bravely resisted the attempted coup gives them a right to a major aid programme," said German Chancellery Minister Rudolf Seiters.

Gorbachev has always been far more popular in the West than among the Soviet people, who have preferred his bitter rival Yeltsin. Now they are co-operating, Yeltsin's popularity has soared and his power has increased dramatically. The reform process is accelerating rapidly and, with the Communist Party's loss of power, the West can claim, more loudly than before, that Communism is dead.

All the above makes it far easier for the United States, the European Community, the former satellite states of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to work together on a common agenda. The building blocks for the New World Order are rapidly falling into place!

FIGHTING BACK AGAINST THE MONEY POWER

by ANDREI KRYLIENKO

AFTER reading in the August-September **Candour** the articles by Nick Griffin urging active opposition to Benetton and Arthur Barkley suggesting a Commonwealth Economic Union, together with the editorial note on the latter indicating the difficulties in the way of implementing the projected union, I venture to submit a proposal for possible action along somewhat similar lines against the Money Power Mafia currently hi-jacking the peoples of Europe into the E.C.

Mr Griffin writes: "Every patriotic individual, nationalist organisation and religious traditionalist could do something. And if we all act, instead of looking on with impotent rage, then we will get results... All that is needed is for every organisation and individual in agreement with this initiative to 'do their own thing' in pursuit of the common goal. What we have in common is the target." The target in this case is to render inoffensive the weapons the Money Power is using to bring the world into total subjection. These weapons are:

USURY: Every country or community that tolerates the practice of usury lays itself open to be bled of its wealth by the usurers and have its economy ruined through inflation and taxation. Patriots wishing to see their country independent and prosperous should eschew at all costs any form of borrowing or credit offered them by banks.

TRADE: The first axiom of the commercial philosophy of the Money Power is that every buying or selling transaction is a source of profit. The only reason, for example, for sales of butter from one dairy farming country to another that produces enough butter for its own needs is to provide profits for the traders concerned and the bankers who finance them. Patriots wishing to be released, and see their fellow-countrymen released, from the industrial and commercial treadmill forcing them to work solely to produce profits for economic parasites (viz. persons whose activity provides nothing the community could not equally well do without) should as far as possible buy only products produced in their own country by firms and workers of their own nationality, and buy goods produced by foreign or multinational companies only when they are necessities and cannot be produced by their own nationals.

MONEY CREATION: The Money Power's most important source of income and power is the authority allowed the financial sector to make money out of nothing and lend it to governments, businesses and private individuals, exacting repayment in real wealth obtained either indirectly through the taxpayer, or direct from the earnings of the borrower. This facility, which is wholly unconstitutional, is the means that has enabled and enables the Money Power to eliminate those whom it cannot suborn, or reduce them to silence. Hence the imminent disappearance throughout Europe of the basic freedoms, and before much longer any pretence of "human rights".

Against this weapon, the individual can do little at summit level, except agitate for monetary reform. As Sir Josiah Stamp, former Governor of the Bank of England, is reported to have said, "As long as the law allows such things, a man is a fool not to be a banker

[emphasis added]." Nevertheless, the action suggested above regarding Usury and Trade, firmly and consistently pursued by individuals and groups, would soon make itself felt. As Mr Griffin writes, "Everybody can do something, however small. And if we all do, we will between us achieve something substantial."

WATCH THIS SPACE

THERE is something noble and appealing about the scientist or historian who sticks to his idiosyncratic theory against all discouragement... David Irving's thesis that Hitler knew nothing about the Holocaust, and certainly never ordered it, is another of those worrying assaults on our generally accepted certainties, and one which provokes real fury in many quarters... Another unfashionable view is the dreaded Navrozov Theory of Contemporary History whereby Gorbachev himself instigated the unsuccessful coup as a means of suppressing the KGB, having already used the KGB to destroy the power of the Communist Party, purely to ensure complete power for himself. By this account, it is not only Boris Yeltsin who is Gorbachev's puppet. So are we all. Can it be true? Time alone will tell.

AUBERON WAUGH in **The Daily Telegraph**, 28th September.

MR HARRINGTON'S IMPLAUSIBLY PLOTLESS WORLD

AN article by Michael Harrington in **The Sunday Telegraph** on September lst ("All the world's a plot") sought to debunk the conspiracy theory of history and those who expound it. An excellent rebuttal by John Tyndall was published the following week, but this reply from B.E. Biggs obviously incurred the Editor's displeasure!

SIR - The 'plotless' world of Michael Harrington, where dirty political manipulating and even assassinations are accidental, random natural phenomena, rather than objective evil, comes across as a cretinous conclusion unworthy of space in your publication. Your contributor's denigration of brilliant political authorities and writers such as Gary Allen, A.K. Chesterton and Nesta Webster is as slick and as snide as it is unwarranted.

Unlike Nesta Webster, whose research for accuracy in her writing was prodigious, Harrington even muddles the authorship of **The New Unhappy Lords** - one of the most enlightening depositions of political plotting - to G.K. Chesterton (A.K.'s relative) from whose poem **The Secret People** the book title was derived: "G.K. Chesterton's uproariously disreputable **The New Unhappy Lords.**" This quotation, like the rest of Mr Harrington's non-plot comes like wind from the anus of a well-entrenched ostrich!

NEW CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES
[thanks to another steep rise in postal charges!]

U.K. £10 OVERSEAS £12 U.S. $25 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Please make cheques payable from now on to THE A.K. CHESTERTON TRUST

Printed and published by the A.K. Chesterton Trust, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. [Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle]